

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/944,328	ELLIOTT, BRIG BARNUM	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeremiah Avery	2131	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) Jeremiah Avery. (3) _____.

(2) Edward A. Gordon, Esq. Reg. No. 54,130. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 July 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. 101, 112, 1st paragraph and 102(e) rejections.

Claims discussed:

1, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 33.

Prior art documents discussed:

United States Patent No. 6,233,075 to Chang et al.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Gordon and the Examiner discussed correction of a punctuation error found within claim 33, as well as clarification of terminology "bases" and "basis" as well as the usage of a "setup message" within the claimed invention. Mr. Gordon authorized the correction of said punctuation error. If there was any need for further clarification, the Examiner was encouraged to contact Mr. Gordon regarding any such matters..